

REMARKS

The Specification stands objected to because of the alleged introduction of new matter by reason of the previous amendment to Specification page 10. Reconsideration of this objection is requested.

In the Applicant's original application, in the second full paragraph on page 5 thereof, it is stated:

Incidentally, although the shape at a time when the caulking projection is viewed from the side can be made, for example, a V shape, a U shape, or an inverted trapezoid, the shape is not fixed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the caulking projection configuration shown in Applicant's Fig. 2 is approximately that of a "V", a "U", and "an inverted trapezoid". The shape shown approximates each of the stated configurations. The claim language does not state that the shape must be precisely a "V", or a "U", or a "trapezoid".

Since this language appears in the original disclosure, it can be properly added by amendment to the detailed description without introducing new matter.

Claims 1 and 3-12 are currently pending in the application. Claims 7, 8, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 USC 112 as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. In light of the above arguments relating to the objection to the Specification, the rejection of these claims, based upon that objection, is believed improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 3-12 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,923,112, to Bertocchi et al (Bertocchi) in view of JP-2002-136015 (JP '015).

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1 and 3-12 is requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that the finality of the December 27, 2006 Office Action be withdrawn. In Amendment "A", Applicant rewrote claim 3/2 in independent form as claim 12. No other amendments were made to this claim. The Examiner changed the basis for the rejection of this claim and thus the finality of the Office Action is improper¹.

In the "Response to Arguments", the Examiner takes the position that claims 1 and 5 do not clearly limit the apparatus and method to one wherein the laminated iron core pieces can be moved relative to the rotation center. While Applicant respectfully disagrees that these limitations are not already in claims 1 and 5, claims 1 and 5 have been further amended to even further clarify the structure and method steps in claims 1 and 5, respectively, in this regard.

Bertocchi discloses only a fixed relationship between the core pieces around the corresponding rotation axis. Nowhere does Bertocchi expressly state the desirability or ability, and nowhere in the disclosure is there an inherent capability, to have this relative movement around a rotation axis. In fact, the structure as disclosed is not capable of allowing relative movement between core pieces around the rotation axis.

As seen in exemplary Fig. 2, three cooperating pairs of clips 3 and cavities 6 are provided in an angular relationship which would preclude relative movement between core pieces around a rotation axis. Additionally, the clips 3, are shown as each filling their respective cavities 6. This more clearly precludes any relative movement between core pieces.

¹ Applicant noted in Amendment "A" that there was no rejection of claim 3/2 in the December 27, 2006 Office Action and thereby rewrote the claim in independent form as claim 12.

The Examiner refers to Figs. 2 and 4 for the alleged disclosure therein of circumferential gaps that are alleged to allow relative movement between the core pieces around the rotation axis. However, the perspective from which Fig. 4 of Bertocchi is taken is not stated or clear. If the spacing shown is in a radial direction, it has no bearing on whether or not the core pieces can be rotated relative to each other in a circumferential direction.

It does not appear that this cross section is in a circumferential direction given that no such space is shown in Fig. 2.

Still further, even if there was a circumferential gap, which Bertocchi does not disclose, by reason of providing the multiple cooperating pairs of clips 3 and cavities 6 at different angles, no relative movement would be possible between the core pieces around the rotation axis.

It is respectfully submitted that Bertocchi does not teach, expressly, inherently, or by suggestion, that the core pieces therein might be relatively moved around a rotation axis after lamination.

The Examiner relies upon JP '015 only for the teachings of an arc-shaped caulking hole. However, JP '015 does not teach or suggest the ability to relatively move core pieces in a circumferential direction around a rotation axis. In fact, JP '015 teaches that the laminated metal sheets are fixed to each other by caulking a clamp groove 114 within depressions 116a and 116b. Relative circumferential positions of the grooves 114 and depressions 116a and 116b may be adjusted marginally preparatory to lamination. However, once the caulking step is performed and the lamination step completed, the

plates are fixed relative to each other and cannot be relatively moved about a corresponding rotation axis.

Consequently, since neither Bertocchi nor JP '015 teaches or suggests the ability to relatively move laminated plates around a rotation axis, together, they clearly lack a teaching or suggestion to arrive at the structure recited in claim 1 or the method recited in claim 5.

Claims 3, 4, and 6-12 depend cognately from claim 1 and recite further significant structural limitations to further distinguish over the cited art.

Withdrawal of the finality of the December 27, 2006 Office Action, entry of the amendment, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1 and 3-12, and allowance of the case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800

Date: April 27, 2007